

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in Application No. 10/500,695, filed on February 7, 2005. A second Office Action was mailed on July 2, 2007.

In the second Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-7, 9-10, 15-16, and 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,090,434 to Benson, Jr. et al. ("the Benson '434 Patent"). Claim 22 was rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the Benson '434 Patent. Claim 8 was rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Benson '434 Patent. Claims 11-14 and 17 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Benson '434 Patent as applied to Claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,443,592 to Unger et al. ("the Unger '592 Patent").

A personal interview between Applicant's representative, David P. Dureska, and Examiners Jason Han and Sandra O'Shea was held on August 14, 2007. Applicant's representative thanks Examiners Han and O'Shea for the courtesies extended to him during the personal interview. Consistent with the interview and follow-up brief telephone conference with Examiner Han, the substance of which is set forth in the Interview Summary dated August 14, 2007, Applicant has amended independent Claims 1 and 22 in order to more particularly point out and distinctly claim Applicant's invention. The basis for the amendments is found in the specification at least at page 5, lines 25-29, and in FIGS. 3, 10, 11, 12, and 13.

Based on the amendments and the arguments set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-22 are now in condition for allowance.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-7, 9-10, 15-16, and 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the Benson '434 Patent. Applicant has amended independent Claim 1 in accordance with the discussions with the Examiners at the personal interview held on August 14, 2007, in order to more particularly point out and distinctly claim Applicant's invention. Applicant respectfully submits that the Benson '434 Patent does not disclose each and every element of newly amended independent Claim 1. More particularly, the Benson '434 Patent does not disclose a modular service unit with a pair of reflector housings, the reflector housings having an open bottom defined by the pair of longitudinal side edges which form generally the lower most surface of the reflector housing, the modular service unit having a bridging plate or intermediate housing releasably attached or supported by adjoining ones of the longitudinal side edges. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Applicant submits that newly amended independent Claim 1 is now in condition for allowance. Because Claims 2-7, 9-10, 15-16, and 18-21 depend directly or indirectly from allowable Claim 1, they too are in condition for allowance.

Claim 22 was rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the Benson '434 Patent. Applicant has amended independent Claim 22 in accordance with the discussions with the Examiners at the personal interview held on August 14, 2007, in order to more particularly point out and distinctly claim Applicant's invention. Applicant respectfully submits that the Benson '434 Patent does not disclose each and every element of newly amended Claim 22. More particularly, the Benson '434 Patent does not disclose a modular service unit with a pair of reflector housings, the reflector housings having an open bottom defined by a pair

of longitudinal side edges which form generally the lower most surface of the reflector housing, the modular service unit further comprising a bridging plate or intermediate housing releasably attached to or supported by adjoining ones of the longitudinal side edges. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Applicant submits that newly amended Independent Claim 22 is now in condition for allowance.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Benson '434 Patent. As set forth above, it is believed that newly amended Claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Because Claim 8 depends indirectly from allowable Claim 1, it too is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 11-14 and 17 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable under the Benson '434 Patent as applied to Claim 1, and further in view of the Unger '592 Patent. As set forth above, it is believed that newly amended Claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Because Claims 11-14 and 17 depend directly or indirectly from allowable Claim 1, they too are in condition for allowance.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims now are in condition for allowance, and reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested and allowance of Claims 1-22 at an early date is hereby respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCKINGHAM, DOOLITTLE & BURROUGHS, LLP



By: Brent L. Moore, Registration No. 42,902
David P. Dureska, Registration No. 34,152

BLM/srp

4518 Fulton Drive, N.W.
P. O. Box 35548
Canton, OH 44735-5548
Telephone: (330) 491-5333
Facsimile: (330) 252-5376
E-Mail: Bmoore@bdblaw.com
Attorney Docket No.: FISHER-B (51373.0010)

«C12:564303_v1»